Von Hortin and Sean B. Thomas, School Finance & Statistics, Utah State Office of Education Phone 801.538.7802, von.hortin@schools.utah.gov; sean.thomas@schools.utah.gov, www.schools.utah.gov/finance

March 26, 2012

2012 Legislative Session Presentation Outline

Bills of Note that Failed:

We are covering several bills that did not pass because the fiscal ramifications would have been enormous to School Districts. We suggest you speak with policy makers regarding your District's view on these initiatives.

- a. FAILED HB 123 Education Savings Accounts
 - i. The bill would have established education savings accounts of \$6,400 per year per student for Grades 9-12;
 - ii. The bill attempts to withhold all these funds from Local and State revenues from each District by withholding not only 9-12 funding but some K-8 funding to extract the local revenue;
 - iii. The students and parents decide how to spend the money on both secondary and college courses, but have up to 10 years to utilize the funds in high school or for college;
 - iv. School Districts would have to bill the students and parents for individual courses in which they enroll in Grades 9-12;
 - v. The bill was sent for interim study, and appeared to have some momentum;
 - vi. The bill could have major effects on special education and other federal grants;
 - vii. The bill could cause issues with bond ratings and budgets.
- b. FAILED HB 158 Student Based Budgeting
 - Legislation based on an article from a study by Brown University http://annenberginstitute.org/pdf/SBB.pdf
 - The study addresses inequity within school districts wherein some schools within a district receive a disproportionate amount of resources compared to others.
 - The study contends that Inter-District funding is primarily based on staffing and facilities rather than student based formulas such as the WPU.
 - The study showed that poorly performing schools were underfunded compared to other schools within the same district in three major urban areas.
 - 4. The study found that District leaders rarely discuss equity within their district.
 - a. In Cincinnati for example, there was a disparity of \$6,000 per pupil between their lowest funded school at \$4,000 and their highest funded school at \$10,000.

- The study focused on urban districts, however, the bill at the Utah
 Legislature would have implemented the changes for ALL districts in the
 State.
- ii. The bill pushes 85% of total District funding to the school level.
- iii. The Principal is in charge of budgeting, accounting, facilities planning and maintenance, and other business management at the school level. This would divert principals' focus from being the instructional leader of each school, to also becoming the budgeting, accounting, and business manager for the school.
- iv. School Level business and accounting personnel would need to increase for implementation. We estimated this will result in an increase in school level administrative costs statewide of approximately \$22.9 million.
- c. FAILED HB 364 School District Budget Reporting Amendments
 - i. Requires financial reporting at the school level.
 - ii. If the Districts posted this information on their websites, the issue may be disarmed.
 - iii. However, the LFA is pushing for this change.
 - iv. Part of the intent seems to be related to the push towards backpack funding and shifting money to charter schools.
- d. The bills that failed should be a marker for what may be to come in future legislative sessions. Please familiarize yourself with these bills and initiatives so that your District can articulate its position in interim meetings and other engagements with policy makers.
- e. DataMart provides a solution to some of the issues raised in the bills that failed.

DataMart Submission Dates and Process

- 1) The Legislative Fiscal Analyst has indicated that USOE should implement DataMart for the fiscal 2012 reporting cycle.
- 2) On or around April 15, 2012, the USOE will send out the DataMart Master sheet to use to submit the following reports. It is the same spreadsheet for all submissions, however, a new spreadsheet for each submission must be completed. Thus, when the 2012 reporting cycle is over, you will have prepared at least three DataMart spreadsheets, and a fourth if you choose to test the system by submitting your 2011 Actual data.
 - a. 2011 Actual optional;
 - b. 2012 Final Budget;
 - c. 2012 Actual;
 - d. 2013 Original Budget.
- 3) We recommend you submit the spreadsheet back to us within a couple of weeks after you receive the DataMart Master with your 2011 Actual data in order to prepare your chart of accounts map, become familiar with the process, and identify issues with exporting your data to the spreadsheet and the mapping process early. This is not required, but strongly recommended.

- 4) On Friday, June 15, 2012, the USOE begins accepting 2013 original DataMart budget submissions. USOE will send back a draft of the 2013 budget AFR output from DataMart for check and review, or we will provide access to the report online. We will send a signature page with the AFR Budget for the business administrator to verify it is accurate and complete. Three (3) business days after you receive the draft, unless we hear back from you, we will presume it is correct. We will still expect to receive the signature page back. You may email the executed signature page to us rather than mail it.
- 5) Monday, July 16, 2012 Deadline to submit an accepted and confirmed DataMart file for 2013 budget unless the District is going through the Truth in Taxation process. Accepted means the data is complete and accurate so that it can be imported into the DataMart database. Confirmed means that the business administrator has signed the signature pages from the DataMart AFR budget we send back indicating it is correct and accurate.
- 6) Friday, August 31, 2012 If the district is going through truth in taxation, this is the deadline to submit an accepted and confirmed DataMart file for the 2013 original budget. Accepted means the data is complete and accurate so that it can be imported into the DataMart database. Confirmed means that the business administrator has signed the signature pages from the DataMart AFR budget we send back indicating it is correct and accurate.
- 7) August 10, 2012 Date USOE begins accepting DataMart files for:
 - a. 2012 Final Budget
 - b. 2012 Actual AFR/APR
 - c. USOE will send the draft AFR and APR to the LEA for check and review, or provide access online.
- 8) Monday, October 1, 2012 Deadline to have submitted an accepted and confirmed DataMart file for 2012 Final Budget, and a separate DataMart file for 2012 Actual data. Accepted means the data is complete and accurate so that it can be imported into the DataMart database and generate an AFR and APR. Confirmed means that the business administrator has signed the signature pages from the DataMart AFR and APR we send back indicating they are correct and accurate.
- 9) We will send a signature page, or provide access to a signature page online, with the AFR Actual and APR for the business administrator to verify the reports are accurate and complete. The signature pages can be emailed back to the USOE, but should be sent no later than October 1, 2012. This means your data would have to be submitted before that deadline so that USOE can send you the AFR and APR reports from the Database.
 - a. Note that USOE will no longer track beginning and ending program balances on the APR. Of course, as always, it is incumbent upon each LEA to track these program balances.
- 10) In accordance with Statute and Rule, if an accurate AFR and APR are not confirmed by the deadline, the USOE may send letters indicating a failure to comply with reporting requirements and begin the process to withhold MSP funding.
- 11) Though not required, we strongly recommend submitting your 2011 actual data on the DataMart master spreadsheet in April or May 2012 to identify any issues before the reporting cycle begins.

- 12) We have prepared an online training for DataMart that you can access from our website, or directly at http://connect.schools.utah.gov/p5sffh1z6rb/, that provides information on:
 - a. Importing the data
 - b. Mapping Funds
 - c. Mapping Programs
 - d. Mapping Functions
 - e. Mapping Objects
 - f. Checking the CSV Out for errors
 - g. Using the pivot tables to check the data
- 13) We will provide a separate spreadsheet for Property Tax, Indirect Costs, Long Term Debt Schedules, and the Negotiations Report.

Bills that Passed:

- 2) Senate Bill 138 Health Insurance Mandates
- 3) House Bill 218 Local Business Administrator Amendments
- 4) House Bill 500 Education Reporting Efficiencies
- 5) House Bill 12 Corrections Education Amendments
 - a. Eliminates the State Board of Regent's responsibility for education of persons in custody at the Utah Department of Corrections;
 - b. Requires the State Board of Education to coordinate with the State Board of Regents on these issues.
- 6) House Bill 261 Dividing School Districts Amendments
 - a. Increases the financial feasibility for school districts to split by allowing both the new and remaining district to impose the same property tax levies for five years after the split as those that were imposed the year before the split irrespective of the property tax base per student. There used to be a limitation that these levies could only continue at their current level if the property tax base per student of a new district was greater than the property tax base per student of the remaining district.
 - b. Splits result in large one-time costs for districts.
 - c. Splits result in higher administrative costs as a percent of instruction in both the new and old district.
 - d. Both the old and the new district may require more revenue to maintain current levels of service, or cut Instruction to pay higher administrative costs.
 - e. Benefits of splitting a district can be weighed against these costs.
 - f. Since the Jordan/Canyons split, the ratio of Functions 2300, 2500, and 2700 collectively to Function 1000 have increased 27.6%.
 - g. Property tax rates in Jordan have increased 20%, while rates in Canyons have increased 16.7%.
- 7) Senate Bill 151 Students At Risk of Academic Failure Study

- Original bill was to provide income tax credits to individuals and businesses for funding scholarships for private school for students that are economically disadvantaged or academically underperforming.
 - i. The definition of qualifying students was so broad, that over half the students in the state would have qualified.
 - ii. USOE estimated approximately \$36.5 million in corporate and individual tax credits would be diverted in the first year from public education to private schools, and \$57.3 million in 2021. A program in AZ that is very similar was used to develop the projections.
- b. The bill that actually passed directs the Education Interim Committee to study programs and initiatives in the State and other states to assist students who score below proficient on assessments of academic achievement or are economically disadvantaged.
- 8) Senate Bill 248 Smart School Technology Act
 - a. Creates a pilot project known as the Smart School Technology Program.
 - b. The program is intended to provide grants to schools for implementing whole school technology platforms.
 - c. The bill does not directly appropriate funds, but appears to make available \$3 million from the Industrial Assistance Account.
 - d. The State Board of Education is directed to:
 - i. Select schools to participate;
 - ii. Make rules for selecting schools;
 - iii. Evaluate the program after its completion for the Education Interim Committee.